lignum testa flexuosa") is applicable to almost any species of *Teredo*; and the expression used by Linnæus, "calamitas navium ex Indiis in Europam propagata," would refer rather to some exotic than to a European species. In the 13th (or Gmelin's) edition, one of the generic characters of *Teredo*, describing the pallets as "lanceolatis," is peculiarly appropriate to *T. Norvagica*. The *T. marina* (or "Hollandische see-wurm") does not, I believe, occur in sailing ships, but only in piles or fixed wood. I examined in vain the Linnæan Collection (which has been partly arranged by Mr. Hanley) for Teredines, but could not find any; and Mr. Hanley admits, in his valuable work entitled 'Ipsa Linnæi Conchylia,' that unfortunately no specimen was preserved in it, so as to ascertain which species Linnæus meant by his *Teredo navalis**. Under these circumstances, I think I am justified in restoring the prior and appropriate name of "*marina*," given by Sellius, who used it in a legitimate sense to distinguish this species from those described by Vallisnieri and other authors.

25, Devonshire Place, Portland Place, London,
Sept. 18, 1860.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE.

Flora of Cambridgeshire; or, a Catalogue of Plants found in the County of Cambridge. By C. C. Babington, M.A., F.R.S., F.L.S. Van Voorst, 1860.

The plants of Cambridgeshire have occupied the attention of many eminent botanists: Mr. Babington mentions, in his 'Introduction,' no less than sixteen treatises bearing upon his subject. But as botany has advanced, so has the surface of the country greatly changed since the times of Ray and of Relhan. With the progress of agriculture and drainage, many species have become scarce, while some have altogether disappeared; on the other hand, large additions have been made to the list, through the industry of Mr. Babington and his colleagues. Hence the need of a new Flora; and we are glad to think the task has fallen into the able hands of the author of the 'Manual of British Botany.'

Mr. Babington has spared no pains to render his work as complete as possible. The older writers have been scrupulously consulted, and the plants referred to their earliest finders. The whole county

* The following extract from Mr. Hanley's work, which was published in 1855, will confirm the view I have taken as to the necessity of rectifying the nomenclature of this species:—"*Teredo navalis*. It is impossible to determine, from the language of Linnæus, to what particular species of ship-worm the very comprehensive term *navalis* should be restricted. Our author has not indicated the possession of examples; consequently his cabinet affords no assistance in the investigation."

has been surveyed afresh, and the distribution of the plants is separately exhibited in a table, where each species is traced through the eight districts into which the county has been divided for botanical purposes; these districts are further elucidated by some clear topographical remarks and a serviceable map. All descriptions of genera and species are intentionally omitted, as out of place in a local Flora, but room is given for the "kind of places" where the plant grows, its duration, and period of flowering. Then follow the localities, arranged under their proper districts; and here the stations which rest upon ancient authority only, are distinguished by being printed in italics.

Great attention has been paid to the introduced plants; and, in addition to the recognized marks of possibly (†) and certainly (*) introduced, we have for the first time a separate brand (‡) reserved for the intermediate cases of "probably naturalized." Several of the "colonists," or weeds of cultivation, receive the brand of "possibly introduced;" and, while we think this will be acknowledged as a step in the right direction, we could have wished to have seen the mark of exotic origin even more freely bestowed on this class.

Arenaria leptoclados (Guss), *Lotus tenuis* (Sm.), and *Triticum pungens* (Pers.), now appear as species. The last, Godron (Flore de France, iii. p. 606) has already noticed as British; and there is reason for believing that the late Mr. E. Forster considered he had gathered it in Essex. Some alterations also occur among the *Rubi*, about which we are promised more information when Mr. Babington's long-expected Monograph appears. In other respects, the arrangement and names correspond with the fourth edition of the 'Manual.'

In an Appendix occur some valuable critical remarks, amounting to so many distinct essays: upon *Thalictrum flexuosum* and *T. saxatile*; upon two plants confounded under the name of *Papaver dubium*; on *Viola canina*, Linn.; on three forms of *Arenaria serpyllifolia*; on several Brambles; on *Serrafalcus*; and on *Triticum*.

The paper on the Vegetation of the Fens is extremely interesting; so is the list of lost plants, which amount to nearly fifty species; among these, *Sonchus palustris*, *Senecio palustris*, *Sturmia Lœselii*, and *Caucalis latifolia* are the most remarkable.

The last few pages are devoted to the enumeration of such plants as find (within Great Britain) their western, northern, or southern limit in the county; and the negative features of the Cambridgeshire flora are illustrated by a comparison with the list given in the sixth chapter of the 'Cybele Britannica' (vol. iv.), from which it appears that out of the 718 species most widely distributed in Britain, 61 are absent from Cambridgeshire.

Enough has been said to show the general plan and arrangement; those who wish for details respecting the species must refer to the work itself. We are sure that Mr. Babington's volume will be highly appreciated, as it deserves to be most carefully studied, especially by those who are engaged in similar labours. Would that we had many other such County Floras!